



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/790,495	03/01/2004	Giuseppe Di Fabrizio	2002-0355A	9524
26652	7590	12/27/2007	EXAMINER	
AT&T CORP. ROOM 2A207 ONE AT&T WAY BEDMINSTER, NJ 07921			KOVACEK, DAVID M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2626	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/790,495

Applicant(s)

DI FABBRIZIO ET AL.

Examiner

David Kovacek

Art Unit

2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 21-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 15-20 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/07/2007.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The applicant has provided an amendment to the application which corrects minor informalities in the specification and claims and amends the limitations in each of **claims 1, 6-8, 22, and 26**. The applicant further provides remarks regarding the patentability of the amended claims with respect to the previous rejections as cited in the previous Office Action.
2. The amendments to the specification with regard to the specified informalities cited in the previous Office Action have been considered and are accepted. The previous objection to the specification has been withdrawn.
3. The amendments to the claims with regard to the specified informalities cited in the previous Office Action have been considered and are accepted. The previous objections to the claims have been withdrawn.
4. Applicant's arguments with respect to the finite state model, added to **claims 1, 22 and 26** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, based on this amendment. Arguments presented in the Remarks, submitted 10/31/2007, regarding the previously existing limitations are addressed in this section.

Regarding the limitation of, "testing and deploying the spoken dialog service using the selected top level flow controller, selected reusable subdialogs and developed subdialogs, wherein the top level flow controller, reusable subdialogs and developed subdialogs interact independent of their decision model" (referred to as Limitation A) of **claim 1**, this limitation seems intended to be directed to an automated or real-time method of generating a dialog manager, which is not claimed. The broadest reasonable interpretation of the claim includes a manual, and/or deliberate non-real-time method of generating a dialog manager. This interpretation has been considered during examination, and is discussed further as appropriate in other sections of this Office Action.

Furthermore, the examiner maintains that the limitation of "deploying" the dialog manager as claimed in Limitation A is in fact inherent to a method of generation of any inventive apparatus, as stated in the previous Office Action. A process or method used to generate a dialog manager with the intention of never deploying is in effect the creating of a device without purposeful usage and, by extension, a lack of utility for said process or method.

Still regarding the limitation of "the top level flow controller, reusable subdialogs and developed subdialogs interact independent of their decision mode" in Limitation A, it is noted by the examiner that the broadest reasonable interpretation of this limitation includes the condition where the various components of the dialog manager are operable to interact

autonomously, or according to known rules. It is further noted by the examiner that though the claim language requires that the various components of the dialog manager are operable to "interact independent of their decision model," the broadest reasonable interpretation of Limitation A does not necessarily preclude interaction influenced also by said respective decision models. These interpretations have been considered during examination.

Regarding the applicant's argument that the term "dialog motivator" as disclosed by Abella would be understood as a separate and distinct concept to a "sub dialog" as claimed in the instant application is not persuasive. The examiner contends that the broadest reasonable interpretation of the term "sub dialog" to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would be any well-defined, determined procedures or operations that exist within a dialog system for the purpose of directing further operations of said dialog system. Though the applicant may act as a lexicographer, there is no evidence in the instant application to specifically preclude this interpretation. Furthermore, this interpretation would include the "dialog motivator" as disclosed by Abella.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

5. **Claims 22-29 and 34** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,356,869 hereinafter referred to as Chapados.

Regarding **claim 22**, Chapados discloses a spoken dialog service supporting context shifts that is built according to a method comprising:

- selecting a top level dialog flow controller [discourse manager] that is a finite state model (Col. 2, lines 20-24);
- selecting available reusable subdialogs for being invoked by the top level flow controller, the reusable subdialogs being isolated from application dependencies (Col. 3, lines 19-22; Col. 8, lines 35-39, lines 42-44; Col. 9, lines 15-21); and
- wherein when a user of the system changes the context of the spoken dialog while in a reusable subdialog, a context shift returns a context shift indication and sets a state in the top level flow controller (Col. 9, lines 39-44).

It is noted by the examiner that "deploying the spoken dialog service" is an inherent part of the generation process of a spoken dialog service as applied above in the Response to the Amendments.

Furthermore, the examiner contends that it would be have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to test any spoken dialog service before use as part of the generation process. This is because for the creation of any novel invention, testing is a known practice in ensuring repeatable and successful results in utilization.

Regarding **claim 23**, Chapados discloses all limitations of **claim 22** as applied above, and further discloses when a top level flow controller receives a context shift from a subdialog and invokes a new subdialog as part of processing the context shift, the new subdialog inherits information associated with the context shift [wildcard transitions] (Col. 8, lines 39-41, 50-52).

Regarding **claim 24**, Chapados discloses all limitations of **claim 23** as applied above, and further discloses when a user of the system changes the context of the spoken dialog while in a reusable subdialog, the context shift returns a message to the parent dialog that a context shift has occurred [context dependent state transition rules 416 depend on the context of the conversation] (Col. 8, lines 42-44).

Regarding **claim 25**, Chapados discloses all limitations of **claim 23** as applied above, and further implies operation wherein a context shift [transition] is triggered by user input [context dependent interpretation capability] and generates a state name where the shift goes (Col. 2, lines 36-45; Col. 3, lines 19-29).

Regarding **claim 26**, Chapados discloses a dialog system having a dialog manager generated according to:

- selecting a top level flow controller based on application type [discourse manager], the top level flow controller being a finite state model (Col. 2, lines 20-24) and
- having application-dependent features such that a reusable subdialog can operate independent of the decision model of the top level flow controller and the decision models of other reusable subdialogs [permanent transition] (Col. 3, lines 19-22);
- determining at least one application part below the top level flow controller, each application part requiring a different flow controller (Co. 2, lines 39-45);

- selecting available reusable subdialogs for each application part (Col. 3, lines 19-29; Col. 8, lines 35-39, lines 42-44; Col. 9, lines 15-21)

It is noted by the examiner that "deploying the spoken dialog service" is an inherent part of the generation process of a spoken dialog service as applied above in the Response to the Amendments.

Furthermore, the examiner contends that it would be have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to test any spoken dialog service before use as part of the generation process. This is because for the creation of any novel invention, testing is a known practice in ensuring repeatable and successful results in utilization.

Regarding **claim 27**, Chapados discloses all limitations of **claim 26** as applied above and further implies operation wherein the dialog manager is further generated by developing a subdialog for each application part not having an available subdialog [temporary transitions created dynamically] (Col. 3, lines 24-29).

Regarding **claim 28**, Chapados discloses all limitations of **claim 26** as applied above and further discloses an input subdialog (Col. 4, lines 14-17, Claim 1).

Regarding **claim 29**, Chapados discloses all limitations of **claim 28** as applied above, and further discloses a confirmation component for inputs of subdialogs (Fig. 4, element 408, Col. 4, lines 28-30, lines 32-37; Col. 11, lines 29-31).

Regarding **claim 34**, Chapados discloses all limitations of **claim 26** as applied above, and further implies control by the top level flow controller [discourse manager] for context shifts (Col. 9, lines 38-44, lines 50-52) in disclosing the condition where a transition is made from one plurality of available states to a second plurality of available states based on a change in finite state parameters [wildcard transitions].

6. **Claims 1-14, 21, 30-33, and 35-36** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chapados in view of Abella, cited in the previous Office Action.

Regarding **claim 1**, Chapados discloses a method for generating a dialog manager for a spoken dialog service, comprising:

- selecting a top level flow controller [discourse manager] that is a finite state model (Col. 2, lines 20-24);
- selecting available reusable subdialogs below the top level flow controller, the reusable subdialogs being isolated from application dependencies (Col. 3, line 19-22; Col. 8, lines 35-39, lines 42-44; Col. 9, lines 15-21);

- testing and deploying the spoken dialog service using the selected top level flow controller, selected reusable subdialogs and developed subdialogs, wherein the top level flow controller, reusable subdialogs and developed subdialogs interact independent of their decision model (Col. 3, lines 19-22).

It is noted by the examiner that "deploying the spoken dialog service" is an inherent part of the generation process of a spoken dialog service as applied above in the Response to the Amendments.

Furthermore, the examiner contends that it would be have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to test any spoken dialog service before use as part of the generation process. This is because for the creation of any novel invention, testing is a known practice in ensuring repeatable and successful results in utilization.

However, though Chapados does imply "developing a subdialog for each application part not having an available subdialog" (Col. 3, lines 24-29) in disclosing the dynamic creation of transitions, this does not necessarily require that the states connected by the transitions are created as necessary.

Abella does disclose the development of subdialogs [dialog motivators] for each part of a dialog manager not having them (Page 3, paragraph 0034). It is noted by the examiner that the broadest reasonable interpretation of "subdialog" would include any

process, device, or mechanism that is part of a composite of a dialog system, such as the dialog motivators disclosed by Abella.

The two references are combinable because each is directed towards a speech dialog manager implemented with a modified finite state model. Abella provides motivation in disclosing the usefulness of a hierarchy of subdialogs [dialog motivators] in the decision model of a dialog manager in order to improve efficiency of the dialog manager during interaction with the user (Page 3, paragraph 0039-0040).

Therefore, the examiner contends that it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Chapados using the teachings of Abella in order to implement a dialog manager that utilizes a hierarchy of subdialogs in order to improve the system's efficiency during interaction with the user.

Regarding **claim 2**, Chapados in view of Abella disclose all limitations of **claim 1** as applied above, and Chapados further discloses the subdialogs manage mixed-initiative conversations with a user (Abstract; Col. 3, lines 63-67).

Regarding **claim 3**, Chapados in view of Abella disclose all limitations of **claim 1**, and Abella further implies that application dependencies are declared

outside of the subdialogs (Page 3, paragraph 0033) in disclosing the use of implementing subdialogs as a self-contained library.

The motivation to combine the references to overcome this limitation is similar to the motivation to combine this art as applied above to **claim 1** because each combination of references is directed to a similar limitation.

Regarding **claim 4**, Chapados in view of Abella disclose all limitations of **claim 3** as applied above and Abella further implies that the application dependencies are part of the top level flow controller [dialog manager application] (Page 3, paragraph 0033) in disclosing the selection of the necessary subdialogs in advance by the designer of the application.

The motivation to combine the references to overcome this limitation is similar to the motivation to combine this art as applied above to **claim 1** because each combination of references is directed to a similar limitation.

Regarding **claim 5**, Chapados in view of Abella discloses all limitations of **claim 1** as applied above, and Abella further discloses the usefulness of subdialogs [dialog motivators] in order to obtain information from the user comprising: telephone number, and address [work location] (Page 4, paragraph 0042). Furthermore, Abella implies the use of subdialogs in order to obtain information, including billing information which inherently requires some form of account number (Page 4, paragraph 0043).

The motivation to combine the references to overcome this limitation is similar to the motivation to combine this art as applied above to **claim 1** because each combination of references is directed to a similar limitation.

Regarding **claim 6**, Chapados in view of Abella discloses all limitations of **claim 1** as applied above, and Abella both discloses (Page 3, paragraph 0041) and provides several operational examples (Page 5, paragraphs 0062, 0071, 0075, 0086, 0092) of operational instances the system providing information or prompts to the user without first receiving user input data. It is noted by the examiner that a "welcome prompt" as disclosed by Abella does in fact provide information to the user by providing evidence of a successful connection to the dialog system and possibly a prompt providing directions for usage.

The motivation to combine the references to overcome this limitation is the same as applied above to **claim 1** as the disclosure of each limitation is directed to improving efficiency of usage of the dialog management system.

Regarding **claim 7**, Chapados in view of Abella discloses all limitations of **claim 1** as applied above, and Chapados further discloses a reusable input subdialog [for continuous speech recognition] (Col. 4, lines 04-17; Claim 1).

It is noted by the examiner that though Chapados does not explicitly disclose that the input subdialog is reusable, this is inherent in disclosing that the input is used for

"continuous" speech recognition because the input would necessarily be used for multiple, distinct input commands in succession.

Regarding **claim 8**, Chapados in view of Abella discloses all limitations of **claim 7** as applied above, and Chapados further discloses a confirmation component [prompt generator] to the input subdialog (Fig. 4, element 408; Col. 4, lines 28-30, lines 32-37; Col. 11, lines 29-37).

Regarding **claim 9**, Chapados in view of Abella discloses all limitations of **claim 7** as applied above, and Abella further discloses examples of the operations of an input subdialog that handles silence (Page 5, paragraphs 0066-0069), rejection (Page 5, paragraphs 0060-0064), low confidence scores (Page 5, paragraphs 0060-0095), and explicit information from the user (Page 5, paragraphs 0091-0096).

The motivation to combine the references to overcome this limitation is the same as applied above to **claim 1** as the disclosure of each limitation is directed to improving efficiency of usage of the dialog management system.

Regarding **claim 10**, Chapados in view of Abella discloses all limitations of **claim 9** as applied above, and in the examples of operation in Abella that apply to the limitations of **claim 9** Abella discloses examples of pre-assigned prompts to the user under special circumstances (Page 5, paragraphs 0059-0096).

The motivation to combine the references to overcome this limitation is the same as applied above to **claim 9** as the disclosure of each limitation is directed to prompting the user in both instances of error and normal operation.

Regarding **claim 11**, Chapados in view of Abella discloses all limitations of **claim 10** as applied above, and Abella discloses a confirmation prompt for the user in the instance of a low confidence score (Page 5, paragraphs 0065, 0069).

The motivation to combine the references to overcome this limitation is the same as applied above to **claim 10** as the disclosure of each limitation is directed to prompting the user in both instances of error and normal operation.

Regarding **claim 12**, Chapados in view of Abella discloses all limitations of **claim 7** as applied above, and Abella further discloses and provides operational examples of an input subdialog that responds to a list including: input prompt (Page 5, paragraphs 0093), yes or no response (Page 5, paragraphs 0095), yes value name (Page 5, paragraph 0095), no value name (Page 6, paragraph 0106), silence category (Page 5, paragraph 0067), reject category (Page 5, paragraphs 0060-000064), confidence threshold (Page 5, paragraphs 0065-0068), and explicit confirm (Page 5, paragraphs 0091-0095).

The motivation to combine the references to overcome this limitation is the same as applied above to **claim 1** as the disclosure of each limitation is directed to improving efficiency of usage of the dialog management system.

Regarding **claim 13**, Chapados in view of Abella disclose all limitations of **claim 1** as applied above, and Abella further discloses the use of subdialogs to obtain billing information (Page 4, paragraph 0043).

The motivation to combine the references to overcome this limitation is similar to the motivation to combine this art as applied above to **claim 1** because each combination of references is directed to a similar limitation.

Regarding **claim 14**, this limitation is very similar to **claim 13** as is rejected for the same reasons.

The examiner contends that **claim 14** is an obvious variation of **claim 13** in that although Abella does not explicitly disclose the use of credit cards with regard to billing, such practices are generally well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made as a popular method of handling billing through a dialog management system, and therefore are within the technological grasp of one of ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a billing module that includes credit card functionality because there is an expectation of success and it would provide a feature that is popular to the end user for the purpose of improving efficiency and expanding the potential user population.

Regarding **claim 21**, Chapados in view of Abella discloses all limitations of **claim 1** as applied above, and Abella further discloses implementing a local context within a dialog data file [domain knowledge] associated with the dialog manager (Page 3, paragraph 0033).

The two references are combinable because each is directed towards a speech dialog manager implemented with a modified finite state model. Abella provides motivation in disclosing the usefulness of independent reusable subdialogs [dialog motivators] for the purpose of easing implementation (Page 3, paragraph 0033).

Therefore, the examiner contends that it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Chapados using the teachings of Abella in order to implement a dialog manager that utilizes reusable subdialogs in order to ease implementation.

Regarding **claim 30**, Chapados discloses all limitations of **claim 29** as applied above, but does not specifically disclose the particular capabilities as applicable to the instant claim.

Abella discloses and provides operational examples of an input subdialog that responds to a list including: input prompt (Page 5, paragraphs 0093), yes or no response (Page 5, paragraphs 0095), yes value name (Page 5, paragraph 0095), no value name (Page 6, paragraph 0106), silence category (Page 5, paragraph 0067), reject category (Page 5, paragraphs 0060-000064), confidence

threshold (Page 5, paragraphs 0065-0068), and explicit confirm (Page 5, paragraphs 0091-0095).

The motivation to combine the references to overcome this limitation is the same as applied above to **claim 1** as the disclosure of each limitation is directed to improving efficiency of usage of the dialog management system.

Regarding **claim 31**, Chapados in view of Abella discloses all limitations of **claim 30** as applied above, and in the examples of operation in Abella that apply to the limitations of **claim 30** Abella discloses examples of pre-assigned prompts to the user under special circumstances (Page 5, paragraphs 0059-0096).

The motivation to combine the references to overcome this limitation is the same as applied above to **claim 30** as the disclosure of each limitation is directed to prompting the user in both instances of error and normal operation.

Regarding **claim 32**, Chapados in view of Abella discloses all limitations of **claim 29** as applied above, and Abella discloses a confirmation prompt for the user in the instance of a low confidence score (Page 5, paragraphs 0065, 0069).

The motivation to combine the references to overcome this limitation is the same as applied above to **claim 1** as the disclosure of each limitation is directed to prompting the user in both instances of error and normal operation.

Regarding **claim 33**, Chapados in view of Abella discloses all limitations of **claim 26** as applied above, and Abella further implies that the reusable subdialogs are selected independent of their decision models (Page 5, paragraph 0059).

The motivation to combine the references to overcome this limitation is the same as applied above to **claim 1** as the disclosure of each limitation is directed to prompting the user in both instances of error and normal operation.

Regarding **claim 35**, Chapados discloses all limitations of **claim 26** as applied above, but does not specifically disclose that available reusable subdialogs contain no application dependencies.

Abella discloses a dialog management system where the available subdialogs [dialog motivators] contain no application dependencies and are instead only dependent upon a pre-determined set of rules for system operation (Page 3, paragraph 0033).

The two references are combinable because each is directed towards a speech dialog manager implemented with a modified finite state model. Abella provides motivation in disclosing the usefulness of independent reusable subdialogs [dialog motivators] for the purpose of easing implementation (Page 3, paragraph 0033).

Therefore, the examiner contends that it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Chapados using the teachings of Abella in order to implement a dialog manager that utilizes reusable subdialogs in order to ease implementation.

Regarding **claim 36**, Chapados discloses all limitations of **claim 26** as applied above, and further implies that subdialogs are directed to obtain user information (Col. 1, lines 01-07; Col. 5, lines 02-09) in disclosing a dialog management system capable of making room or dinner reservations. However, Chapados does not specifically disclose subdialogs directed to specific pieces of user identification data.

Abella further discloses the usefulness of subdialogs [dialog motivators] in order to obtain information from the user comprising: telephone number and address [work location] (Page 4, paragraph 0042). Furthermore, Abella implies the use of subdialogs in order to obtain information, including billing information which inherently requires some form of account number (Page 4, paragraph 0043).

The two references are combinable because each is directed towards a speech dialog manager implemented with a modified finite state model. Abella provides motivation in disclosing the usefulness of a hierarchy of subdialogs [dialog motivators] in the decision model of a dialog manager in order to improve efficiency of the dialog manager during interaction with the user (Page 3, paragraph 0039-0040).

Therefore, the examiner contends that it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Chapados using the teachings of Abella in order to implement a dialog manager that utilizes a hierarchy of subdialogs in order to improve the system's efficiency during interaction with the user.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. **Claims 15-20** are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding **claim 15**, Chapados in view of Abella discloses all limitations of **claim 1** as applied above, but does not further disclose the top level flow controller is a recursive transition network (RTN) flow controller.

The most appropriately applied prior art regarding the use of RTN networks in dialog management systems that was found during examination was Brown, cited in a previous Office Action, which describes the use of RTN networks for the purposes of constructing a grammar requiring a minimum amount of resources (Col. 7, lines 21-29, lines 35-39).

However, Brown fails to make use of the RTN network as a flow control in dialog management, and does not present any suggestion nor render obvious the usage of RTN networks for the purposes of control in a dialog management system.

Regarding **claims 16-20**, these claims are directly dependent upon the allowable **claim 15** and provide further limitation and are therefore also allowable for the same reasons.

Terminal Disclaimer

8. The terminal disclaimer filed on 11/07/2007 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of US Patent Application No. 10/790,218 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Sakoe (US Patent 4,326,101) teaches a system for recognizing word sequences using state transition models.
- Gorin (US Patent 6,941,266) teaches a method and system for predicting problematic dialog events in a task classification system.
- Young (US Patent Publication 2002/0193907) teaches a control system for a modular, mixed initiative, dialog management system.

10. Please note that though the examiner providing signatory authority for this action has changed, the examination has been performed by the same examiner throughout prosecution.

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Kovacek whose telephone number is (571) 270-3135. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached on (571) 272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Application/Control Number:
10/790,495
Art Unit: 2626

Page 24

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DMK 12/20/2007



DAVID HUDSPETH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER